UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/689,348 | 10/20/2003 | Stephan Grunow | TI-36564 | 4206 |
| -* ··· · | 7590 09/20/200 LUMENTS INCORPO | EXAMINER | | |
| P O BOX 6554 | | MOVVA, AMAR | | |
| DALLAS, TX | /3203 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE | |
| | | 2891 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/20/2007 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com uspto@dlemail.itg.ti.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-----------------|---------------|
| 10/689,348 | GRUNOW ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Amar Movva | 2891 |

| | Amar Movva | | 2891 | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover shee | et with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>20 July 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | the same day as filing ving replies: (1) an amo tice of Appeal (with ap | a Notice of A endment, affi peal fee) in c | Appeal. To avoid aba davit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl | ce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or to the mailing date TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | dvisory Action, or (2) the ater than SIX MONTHS fr (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (i | om the mailing | date of the final rejection | on. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the correspor shortened statutory period than three months after t | nding amount of I for reply origin | of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Offi | ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR | 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or | nsideration and/or sea w); tter form for appeal by | rch (see NOT | TE below); | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | , | | (DTO) 004) |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. | | e of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). | | a separate, t | timely filed amendme | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | l be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections | under appea | al and/or appellant fai | ls to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the cl | laims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| 11. $igtiises$ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the | application in | condition for allowar | ice because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No | o(s) | | |
| | | | | |
| | | • | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicant's arguments that claims 1-18 do not constitute new matter under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, applicant states that portions of the specification, namely pg. 8 lines 4-17 provide the basis to overcome the new matter rejection. This arugement is not persuasive. Examiner notes that applicant's independent claims state that the first contiguous barrier layer (70) is formed to thickness X1 over said upper surface (35) of the low K dielectric layer (20) within the trench and X2 on the sidewalls of the trench, wherein the ratio of X1 to X2 is 3:2. The applicable standard for determination of an instance of new matter is that the new claim matter is neither expressly or inherently disclosed.

Regarding the lack of express disclosure, Applicant's specification discloses a 3:2 ratio vis a vis X1:X2, wherein X1 refers to the barrier layer (70) on the upper surfaces (35) of the low K dielectric outside of the trench (see e.g. fig. 2a) and X2 is thickness on the sidewalls of the trench, thus applicant's disclosure only supplies support that the barrier layer is formed to a thickness X1 (ratio 3:2) outside of the trench. While it is possible to, in view of fig. 2a, to find support in applicant's disclosure that a portion of the contiguous barrier layer (70) is thicker in the trench than on the sidewalls of the trench it is not sufficient to support a claim that the ratio of X1 to X2 is 3:2 with X1 in the trench.

Furthermore disclosure does not inherhely show a 3:2 ratio since issues that would cause the thicker portion of 70 in the trench vis a vis thicker portion outside of the trench to vary (in PVD and CVD as specified in the specification as the methedology of depositing layer 70) would be poor step coverage depending on the specific materials of the deposition, a lack of knowledge as to what angles were used in the deposition, and whether or not the deposition may have had multiple steps with masks to isolate certain areas for deposition.

PLEASE NOTE: A new examiner, Amar Movva, has been assigned to this case. Applicant is advised to note the new contact information for the examiner:

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amar Movva whose telephone number is 571-272-9009. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bradley Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571- 273-8300